

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING

11.1 Setting

This section of the EIR examines the setting for land use planning. It first describes the location of the project area, and then presents the regional and local settings. Next, it discusses the zoning of JDSF and the land uses of ownerships surrounding JDSF.

11.1.1 Property Location

JDSF covers approximately 48,652 acres in central Mendocino County. It varies from 4 to 8 miles wide in a north-south direction, and is nearly 18 miles long on the east-west axis. Its western boundary is within 1.5 miles of the coast, and the eastern boundary generally lies on the crest of the Mendocino Ridge separating the coastal slopes from the inland valleys, approximately 7.0 miles west of Willits (see Map Figure A in the attached Map Figures section).

The JDSF boundary is irregular, especially at the western end where the property line zigzags following section and subsection lines. There are 11 privately owned parcels within the ownership, most in the southwest corner. A large private ownership extends into the middle of JDSF from the south (See Map Figure A).

The City of Fort Bragg, where JDSF headquarters facility is located, is 2 miles north of the western property boundary. The town of Mendocino is located 2 miles west of the southwest corner of JDSF; Ukiah, the county seat, is 35 miles southeast of JDSF.

11.1.2 Regional Setting

The regional setting for JDSF land use is Mendocino County. This regional basis was selected because the county is the unit of planning and authority for land use for JDSF and a significant amount of surrounding area.

Mendocino County has three zoning divisions: Inland, Coastal, and the town of Mendocino. Similarities exist between the three divisions and have been grouped according to their common features. Table VII.11.1 summarizes zoning classifications by area and percent for the county. Figure VII.11.1 provides an explanation of the zoning classes.¹

¹ To simplify presentation and discussion, some similar land use classes were combined. For example, Suburban Residential and Remote Residential were combined with Rural Residential. Where controlled by the State Department of Parks and Recreation, areas classified as Open Space, Public Facilities, or Forest Land were designated as State Park to better illustrate their actual use in the Local Setting section, based on the CWE assessment area.

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR PROPOSED JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Table VII.11.1 Summary of Mendocino County Land Use.		
Land Use Group	Mendocino County	
	Acres	Percent
Agriculture	27,415	1
Agriculture - Williamson Act	44,764	2
Commercial	1,184	<1
Commercial Residential Mixed	17,570	1
Forest Land	93,416	4
Forest Land - Timber Production (TPZ)	832,305	37
Industrial	2,580	<1
Open Space	34,452	2
Public Facilities	315,764	14
Rangeland	290,878	13
Rangeland - Williamson Act	447,637	20
Residential	5,782	<1
Rural Residential	132,399	6
Total	2,246,145	100
Source: Derived from spatial data provided to CDF by Mendocino County Planning Department.		

The largest land use in Mendocino County is Forest Land under Timber Production Zone (TPZ) taxation contract (832,305 acres or 37 percent of the county); another 93,416 acres (4 percent) is Forest Land not under TPZ. The next largest land use in the county is Rangeland under the Williamson Act (447,637 acres or 20 percent); another 290,878 acres (13 percent) is Rangeland not under Williamson Act. A related significant land use class is Agriculture. A total of 72,179 acres (3 percent) are in Agriculture, with 44,764 acres (2 percent) under Williamson Act and 27,415 acres not under the Williamson Act.²

² The Williamson Act and Timber Production Zone programs are state subvention programs established to provide landowners with an incentive to keep lands in commodity production. These areas are established through contracts between owners and the county. Under the designation, property taxes are based on commodity production potential rather than speculative land value. TPZ owners pay a harvest-value-based timber yield tax at the time of harvest. In exchange, owners accept a ten-year restriction on use of their property. The restriction is automatically extended each year unless the owner gives notice to the county. See the California Timberland Productivity Act of 1982, Government Code § 51100 et seq.

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR PROPOSED JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Agricultural is the on-site production of plant and animal products by agricultural methods. Examples include: vineyards, horticulture, row and field crops, grazing of livestock, animal husbandry, and tree crops (tree-grown agricultural products). Agriculture zoning allows one dwelling per 40 acres. Agriculture parcels under the Williamson Act can be as small as 10 acres where adjacent to existing Williamson Act land to preserve the unique characteristics of the agricultural enterprises in the area.

Rangeland is typically used for the grazing of livestock but also includes the protection of such natural resources as watershed lands from fire, pollution, erosion, and other detrimental effects and intermixed smaller parcels and other contiguous lands necessary for the protection and efficient management as Rangelands. Parcels may have one dwelling per 160 acres. The minimum parcel size for Rangeland under the Williamson Act is 100 acres since large acreages are thought necessary to maintain an economically viable ranching operation.

Timberland Production is applied to areas because their general soil types, location and timber growing capabilities are suited for and should be devoted to the growing, harvesting, and production of timber and timber related products and are taxed as such. This is a contract with the landowner. Minimum parcel size is 160 acres; one dwelling per 160 acres permitted, with a maximum of four for the total ownership.

Forest Land is applied to areas suited for the growing, harvesting and production of timber and timber-related products, but typically applied to lands not zoned Timberland Production but which have the present or future potential for timber production, intermixed smaller parcels and other contiguous lands, the inclusion of which is necessary for the protection of efficient management of timber resource lands.

Public Facilities are those properties used for public purposes or for specified public utility purposes. They include government administrative services, fire and police protection services, community recreation, cultural exhibits, libraries, day care, schools, cemeteries, utilities and land owned or controlled by the U.S. Forest Service, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, and State Parks.

Open Space includes land that is not suited for development, is more valuable in their undeveloped natural state or to public parklands. Because of their value they may have been dedicated under Government Code Section 51050 or 51080 as privately owned Open Space to a public or nonprofit organization which qualifies under Internal Revenue Code Section 501(c)(3) or an easement which ensures the retention of land in Open Space. Examples of Open Space are the Willits watershed around the city lake, State of California parks along the coast and large blocks of vacant ownership.

Residential use type refers to the residential occupancy of dwelling units by families on a monthly or longer basis. These are typically single, multifamily dwellings or apartments.

Rural Residential is areas of low-density agricultural compatible with permanent residential uses. Typically non-prime production lands that have constraints to commercial agriculture, timber production or grazing. These are typically rural or semi-rural areas where urban levels of service are not available.

Commercial use types include the distribution and sale or rental of goods; and the provision of services other than those classified as civic uses. Examples of commercial zoning includes sales and services in agricultural, animal, automotive, building maintenance, financial, business equipment, communications, construction, retail and wholesale sales storage and distribution, as well as administrative or business offices, commercial recreation, cottage industries, restaurants, mail order, funeral homes, laundry mats, recycling or redemption centers and transient habitation.

Industrial use types include on-site production of goods by methods not agricultural or extractive in nature. This includes custom manufacturing on-site production of individually crafted goods using hand tools or mechanical equipment typically found in a home shop, industrial plants primarily engaged in manufacturing, compounding, processing, assembling, packaging, treatment or fabrication of materials and products, and other industrial plants or uses involving the compounding of radioactive materials, petroleum refining or manufacturing of explosives.

Figure VII.11.1. Descriptions of Mendocino County Land Use Classes.

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR PROPOSED JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Public Facilities (315,764 acres or 14 percent) constitute the next largest land use class. Combined with the similar Open Space class (34,452 acres or 2 percent); these classes combined comprise 16 percent of the county. The largest components of these classes are the Mendocino National Forest in the northeastern portion of the county (176,000 acres) and State Parks (24,000 acres).

Rural Residential lands comprise 132,399 acres or 6 percent of the county. These are typically areas of low-density agricultural compatible with permanent residential uses. The remaining types are Commercial Residential Mixed, Residential, Industrial, and Commercial, in descending order of area. These four land use classes total only 27,116 acres or 1.2 percent of the county.

11.1.3 Local Setting

The local setting for land use planning is the Cumulative Watershed Effects (CWE) Assessment Area (see Figure V.3). This basis was selected since it is the biophysically appropriate assessment area for the issues of greatest concern for JDSF management, i.e., fisheries, water quality, and wildlife habitat. For examining this area more immediately surrounding JDSF, state parks were placed into a separate land use class, since this better describes these lands' uses than designations such as open space or public facilities.

Map Figure X shows the land use classifications for the CWE Assessment Area. Within the assessment area, the land use is significantly different than the county as a whole (Table VII.11.2). Here, Forest Land is 81 percent of the area (175,707 acres), with 79 percent (171,130 acres) under TPZ and 2 percent (4,577) not under TPZ. The CWE assessment area has about twice the percentage of Forest Land (81 percent versus 41 percent) as the county as a whole.

Rangeland in the CWE Assessment Area is about 6 percent (12,802 acres) with the bulk of it in the South Fork of the Big River and two other blocks, one at the Highway 20 summit in the east end of the CWE area and the other around McGuire's opening on Highway 20. Most Rangeland is under the Williamson Act. There is very little Agriculture within the CWE Assessment Area, just 157 acres or less than 1 percent of the area. Rural Residential represents 5 percent (11,657 acres) of the CWE Assessment Area. The majority of it is along the coast with several small blocks up along the eastern ridgeline of the CWE area.

State parks comprise 11,286 acres or about 5 percent of the assessment area. Public facilities account for 3,329 acres, or 1.5 percent of the area. The remaining types are Commercial, Industrial, and Residential, which total less than 1 percent (1,730 acres) of the CWE area.

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR PROPOSED JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Table VII.11.2. Summary of Land Use in Cumulative Watershed Effects Assessment Area.		
Land Use Group	CWE Assessment Area	
	Acres	Percent
Agriculture	157	0.1%
Agriculture - Williamson Act	0	0%
Commercial	174	0.1%
Commercial Residential Mixed	944	0.4%
Forest Land	4,577	2.1%
Forest Land - Timber Production (TPZ)	171,130	79.0%
Industrial	46	0.0%
Public Facilities	3,329	1.5%
Rangeland	1,678	0.8%
Rangeland - Williamson Act	11,124	5.1%
Residential	566	0.3%
Rural Residential	11,657	5.4%
State Parks	11,286	5.2%
Total	216,668	100.0%
Source: Derived from spatial data provided to CDF by Mendocino County Planning Department; modified to show state parks as a land use group.		

11.1.4 JDSF Zoning

Ninety-nine percent of the JDSF ownership is zoned by Mendocino County as TPZ; the remaining 1 percent is Rangeland under the Williamson Act. The TPZ designation was created by Mendocino County in accordance with the State's Timberland Productivity Act of 1982. Land use in a TPZ district is restricted to growing and harvesting timber as well as certain other compatible uses (see section 11.2.2, below), and establishes a presumption that timber harvesting will occur on such lands (Government Code § 51115.1).³ Approximately 300 acres of JDSF is located within the Coastal Zone, but

³ GC § 51115.1 (a) The zoning of a parcel pursuant to this chapter shall give rise to a presumption that timber operations, as defined in Section 4527 of the Public Resources Code, may reasonably be expected to and will occur on that parcel.

(b) The Legislature hereby declares that the enactment of this section is intended to make clear that the zoning of a parcel pursuant to this chapter is an indication that timber operations are expected to occur on that parcel at a future date. The Legislature further declares that this section is not intended and shall not be construed as altering any substantive or procedural requirement of Chapter 8 (commencing with Section 4511) of Part 2 of Division 4 of the Public Resources Code, or of any rule or regulation adopted pursuant thereto.

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR PROPOSED JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

this portion of the Property does not qualify as a Special Treatment Area; therefore, special restrictions are not applicable.

11.1.5 Lands Surrounding JDSF and Potential Acquisitions

Lands to the north and south of JDSF are classified as Forest Land in the Mendocino County General Plan. Lands to the east of JDSF are classified as Forest Land and Range. The combined land use classifications for the west side of JDSF are Rural Residential and state parks (See Map Figure X). Rural Residential is areas of low-density agricultural (including timber production) compatible with permanent residential uses. The greatest potential for conflict between JDSF and private landowners is in the Rural Residential areas where harvesting practices on JDSF could indirectly impact the private lands. Examples of these impacts are aesthetics, change in wildlife habitat, and noise impacts.

The southwest portion of JDSF has several state parks as neighbors. Issues related to state parks as neighbors are addressed in the Aesthetics and Recreation sections of the EIR.

The DFMP discusses the potential purchase of inholdings within JDSF (DFMP, pages 7, 86-87).⁴ By filling in the existing inholdings, the property could be managed on a watershed basis, rather than arbitrary historical boundaries, thus facilitating the management goals of the Forest. The majority of inholdings are located within the western portion of JDSF, generally between County Roads 408 and 409. The inholding that is bisected by Highway 20 and is located in the headwaters of the SF Noyo River is currently owned by Soper-Wheeler and Hawthorne Timber Company. Coastal Ridges LLC currently owns the one inholding located within the eastern portion of JDSF. This property consists of approximately 160 acres within the James Creek watershed. These inholdings could be incorporated into JDSF through land or timber trades, or through purchase, should the funds become available and the current owners be willing to sell.

There is one major outholding of approximately 800 acres, the McGuire Ranch, located on the east side of Mendocino Woodlands, within the Upper SF Noyo area (DFMP, page 86). JDSF's property configuration can also be adjusted through minor property boundary changes. These areas include Riley Ridge (between SF Noyo and Noyo River), Three Chop Ridge (between Big River and Noyo River), and various locations along the southern boundary of the Forest. Private timber companies generally own these areas, which make the adjustments potentially feasible through either land or timber trade with adjacent owners.

⁴ Page references to the DFMP refer to the electronic version (PDF) posted at the Board's website: http://www.bof.fire.ca.gov/pdfs/jdsf_mgtplan_master%203b.pdf.

11.2 Management and Land Use Policies

11.2.1 JDSF Management

Management of JDSF is dictated by the enabling legislation for the State Forest program (PRC Sections 4631–4658) and by the Board of Forestry's policies for management of State Forests (Board of Forestry, 1978) (see Section II, Introduction, and Appendix 5, Statutes, Regulations, and Policies Governing State Forests). Essentially, the State Forest program exists to demonstrate economic forest management practices, as well as, promoting recreational use (refer to Part III, Project Information).

In addition to timber management and related research, land uses on JDSF include camping and picnicking facilities, as well as two separate conservation camps (jointly administered by the CDF and California Department of Corrections), including four permanent residences and a mobile home park for state employees. In addition, the Woodlands Forest Fire Station is located on JDSF property near County Road 408 (Little Lake Road). Remnants from the Caspar Lumber Company include a schoolhouse, a large equipment barn, and numerous abandoned historic railroad grades and trestles.

11.2.2 Mendocino County General Plan Land Use Designation and Policies

JDSF is designated as Forest Lands in the Mendocino County General Plan (Mendocino County, 1981, rev. 1993). The Forest Lands classification applies to all lands that is suited for and is appropriately retained for the growing, harvesting, and production of timber and timber-related products. The classification should include lands eligible to be zoned Timberland Production, intermixed smaller parcels, and other contiguous lands. Uses consistent with the Forest Lands designation include forestry, timber processing, agricultural uses, cottage industries, residential uses, recreation, and uses determined to be related to and compatible with forestry.

Currently, Mendocino County is updating their general plan. Although this plan will not be finalized until 2006 or 2007, there are no foreseeable changes occurring within the plan that may affect land use either within or adjacent to JDSF, according to the Mendocino County Senior Long Range Planner, Pam Townsend (Personal communication).

The incorporated town of Fort Bragg is located near the Forest's western border, but it does not have a sphere of influence extending into JDSF boundaries.

11.3 Regulatory Framework

Land use impacts are typically described as inconsistencies with applicable land use plans and policies. In accordance with California law, local governments directly control land use on privately-owned lands through general plans and zoning ordinances. The General Plan provides policy direction regarding land use, and the zoning code provides specific mechanisms to implement General Plan policies. JDSF, as a state-owned forest is not directly subject to the County General Plan or zoning standards; however, operation of JDSF should not result in conflicts with General Plan policies, particularly as they relate to compatibility with surrounding land uses.

The Mendocino Planning Department does not require a formal consistency determination for the adoption of the JDSF Management Plan (Personal communication with Frank Linch, Senior Planner). They do however request that a consistent setback zone for properties within and outside of the coastal zone that border TPZ be established. The Local Coastal Program (LCP) requires a 200-foot setback distance from residential areas adjacent to TPZ, but in prior instances with local landowners, they have requested that the setback zone be reduced from 200 feet to either 50 or 100 feet.

Other regulatory mechanisms, such as the California Forest Practice Rules (CDF, 2002), the Basin Plan of the RWQCB, and various endangered species recovery plans, indirectly control land use; compatibility with these plans is analyzed elsewhere in this report, under the appropriate resource category heading (e.g., VII.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, VII.6.6, Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat).

The Forest Practice Rules require identification and notification of neighboring landowners within 300 feet of proposed harvest operations:

§1032.7 Plan Submittal and Notice of Intent

- (c) The RPF preparing the plan shall submit to the Director, with the plan, a Notice of Intent to Harvest Timber (Notice of Intent):
 - (1) if any proposed boundary lies within 300 feet of any property not owned by the timberland owner, or
 - (2) any plan amendment that changes a plan boundary so that the new boundary lies within 300 ft. of property not owned by the timberland owner, or
 - (3) with any plan amendment that changes the silvicultural method if a Notice of Intent was required for the plan by condition (1) or (2) above.
- (d) A Notice of Intent shall include the following information:
 - (1) The names of the timberland owner, the RPF who prepared the Plan, and the Plan Submitter.
 - (2) The location of the plan area by county, section, township, and range, and the approximate direction and distance to the plan area from the nearest community or well-known landmark.

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR PROPOSED JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

- (3) The name of and distance from the nearest perennial stream and major watercourse flowing through or downstream from the Plan area.
 - (4) The acres proposed to be harvested.
 - (5) The regeneration methods and intermediate treatments to be used.
 - (6) The estimated earliest date that the Director may approve the plan.
This is 15 days from receipt of the Plan by the Department, except in counties for which rules and regulations have been adopted pursuant to Sec. 4516.5 and 4516.8 of the PRC where the earliest date the Director may approve the Plan is 45 days after the receipt of the plan by the Department.
 - (7) A statement that the public may review the plan at the appropriate Regional Office of CDF and that a copy of the plan may be obtained from the Department upon payment of the applicable charge.
 - (8) A map which provides the approximate boundary of the THP area, a map legend, and a scale. This map shall be posted with the Notice of Intent.
 - (9) A statement that questions or concerns regarding the specific THP should be directed to the applicable CDF Regional Office for public input incorporation into an Official Response Document.
 - (10) A statement of whether there is a known overhead electric power line on the proposed plan area except lines from transformers to service panels.
- (e) The RPF preparing the plan shall furnish to the Department at the time of submission of the plan, the names and mailing addresses of all property owners within 300 ft. of the plan boundary. Either a list compiled from the latest equalized assessment roll or a list provided by a title company doing business in California compiled within 60 days of submission of the plan shall be deemed sufficient for compliance with the subsection.
 - (f) The Department shall mail copies of the Notice of Intent within two working days of receipt of the plan to all persons identified in (e) above.
 - (g) Prior to plan submission, the person submitting the Plan shall post a copy of the Notice of Intent including a map as described in (d)(8) at a conspicuous location on the public road nearest the Plan site. Said Notice of Intent shall be on colored paper or identified with colored flagging so as to be easily visible to the public.

Forest Practice Rules section 913.1, Regeneration Methods Used in Evenaged Management, requires:

- (a) Timber stands harvested under an evenaged regeneration method shall meet the following standards. . .
 - (7) Special consideration for aesthetic enjoyment and protection of adjacent stand vigor shall be given to the selection of silvicultural methods and timber operations within 200 feet of adjacent non-federal lands not zoned TPZ.

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR PROPOSED JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Management of JDSF is also dictated by the enabling legislation for the State Forest program (PRC Sections 4631–4657) and by the Board of Forestry’s policies for management of State Forests (Board of Forestry, 1978). These management directives are presented in Appendix 5, Statutes, Regulations, and Policies Governing State Forests.

11.4 Proposed JDSF Management Measures

The DFMP contains a number of proposed specific management measures intended to address potential land use impacts or conflicts:

- A 200-foot neighbor buffer will be maintained for specified residential areas that are adjacent to JDSF, which will comprise a total of approximately 1,153 acres. The neighbor buffer is mapped and displayed in Map Figure D, Special Concern Areas. These areas are generally considered capable of sustainable timber production at some level. Only a limited range of silviculture is allowed in these areas (DFMP page 149). In most cases, only light harvesting, such as uneven-aged single tree selection prescriptions (DFMP, pages 46 and 48), that retains large trees and a significant portion of the stand density will occur.
- The DFMP sets a management goal to “improve the boundary layout of the State Forest to facilitate management logistics and increase demonstration and research opportunities,” (DFMP, p. 5). This goal may be made by acquisitions via trades or purchase, as discussed above and in the DFMP (p. 7, 86-87, and 147).

In general, to avoid land use conflicts, an integrated public review process that incorporates local community input into the Management Plan and proposed management practices that seek to limit and or eliminate potential conflict with adjacent residential properties will be implemented. CDF also has comment authority on private project approvals adjacent to JDSF that may interfere with management operations. The Project Information Section of this report (Section III) contains additional discussion regarding legislative requirements for the State Demonstration Forests and Board Policy.

The JDSF management plan will be consistent with the current Forest Practice Rules where they apply. Please refer to each applicable section for conformance guidelines as they relate to the Rules.

CDF has verified that the DFMP is consistent with all other CDF plans and policies.

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR PROPOSED JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

11.5 Thresholds of Significance

Based on policy and guidance provided by CEQA (PRC Section 21001 and the CEQA Guidelines), an impact of the proposed project would be considered significant if it causes one or more of the following:

- Physical division of an established community or a conflict with any applicable habitat or community conservation plans;
- A conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

11.6 Impacts

Impact 1: Would the project cause the physical division of an established community or a conflict with any applicable habitat or community conservation plans (No Impact).

There are no habitat or community conservation plans that are applicable to the project area that may be in conflict with the adoption of the DFMP. JDSF is located within a rural area; therefore, the implementation of the Management Plan will not divide an established community. Thus, it is found that there is no potential for significant adverse impact. These circumstances apply to all seven alternatives considered in this EIR.

Mitigation: None Required.

Impact 2: Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect (Less than Significant).

With the exception of state parks (addressed in the Recreation and Aesthetics section of the EIR), the land use associated with inholdings and adjacent parcels is generally Timber Production or Rural Residential. JDSF is almost entirely zoned TPZ, with a long history of forest management activity. The Timberland Productivity Act states, "Timber operations conducted [on TPZ land pursuant to the FPRs]...shall not constitute a nuisance, public or private" (GC § 51115.5).

The Mendocino Planning Department does not require a formal consistency determination for the adoption of the Management Plan (Personal communication with Frank Linch, Senior Planner). The General Plan Coastal Element requires that residences be set back at least 200 feet from parcels zoned Forestland (Coastal Element Policy 3.3-8). The DFMP states that a mapped 200-foot neighbor buffer, where silvicultural treatments will be limited, will be maintained where there are adjacent

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR PROPOSED JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

residential parcels. Thus, the DMFP will have a less than significant impact with respect to Land Use Impact 2.

Given the lack of management under Alternative A, there would be no impact. Alternative B would comply with Forest Practice Rules (e.g., notification of neighboring landowners within 300 feet of proposed harvest operations) and there would be a less-than-significant impact, given that harvest operations on TPZ are statutorily defined as not constituting a nuisance. Alternatives C2 and D provide similar neighbor buffers as C1, and thus would result in a less-than-significant impact. Alternative E provides a somewhat higher level of neighbor protection than C1 by prohibiting harvest adjacent to non-timberland owners, and would have a less-than-significant impact. Alternative F provides no neighbor buffers, though it restricts potential harvesting impacts on neighbors by minimizing the amounts of even-aged management. Alternative F would have a less-than-significant impact.

In addition, refer to the Noise, Recreation, and Aesthetic Sections for related discussion.

Mitigation: None Required.

11.7 Cumulative Impacts

Impact 3: Would implementation of the Management Plan result in adverse cumulative impacts to adjacent landowners in the form of reduced enjoyment in the use of their property or a loss of property values (Less than Significant).

JDSF is primarily surrounded by industrial and nonindustrial timberland. The DFMP provides a 200-foot buffer with restricted harvesting practices adjacent to residential parcels. County land use regulations dictate that timber management on lands zoned TPZ, as is JDSF, shall not be construed a nuisance. Given these circumstances, no potential was identified for land use related cumulative impacts for the proposed project (alternative C1).

Because of the minimal management activity permitted under alternative A, potential cumulative impacts would be less than significant under this alternative. Given provisions similar to C1 for alternatives C2 and D, prohibitions on harvest adjacent to nontimberland owners in alternative E, and the minimal amounts of even-aged management that would be permitted under Alternative F, there is less than significant potential for significant adverse cumulative effects for any of these five alternatives.

Alternative B provides less protection to neighbors than the other alternatives. While it would comply with Forest Practice Rules (e.g., notification of neighboring landowners within 300 feet of proposed harvest operations), it provides no neighbor buffers. Alternative B makes greater use of intensive evenaged harvest prescriptions than any of the other alternatives. While harvest operations on TPZ are statutorily defined as not

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR PROPOSED JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

constituting a nuisance, repeated intensive harvests adjacent to non-timberland ownerships could impact the adjacent landowner's enjoyment of his/her property and reduce land values. This impact could be mitigated to less than significant through the use of a 200-foot neighbor buffer.

Mitigation: None required for project alternative.

11.8 Alternatives Comparison

A comparison of land use impacts among the various alternatives is presented in Table VII.11.3.

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR PROPOSED JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Table VII.11.3. Comparison of Land Use Impacts Among the Various Alternatives.										
Alternatives						Discussion				
Impact*	1	2	3	4	5	*Impact Levels: (1) Beneficial (2) No Impact (3) Less than Significant (4) Less than Significant after Mitigation (5) Significant–Mitigation Not Feasible				
Impact 1. Physically divide of an established community or a conflict with any applicable habitat or community conservation plans.										
Alt. A						The JDSF is within a rural, resource setting with several public access roads running through the site. None of the alternatives would result in the physical division of a community. No habitat or community conservation plans are applicable to JDSF.				
Alt. B										
Alt. C1 May 2002 DFMP										
Alt. C2 Nov. 2002 Plan										
Alt. D										
Alt. E										
Alt. F										
Impact 2. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.										
Alt A						Given the minimal level of management activity under this alternative, there will be no impact.				
Alt. B						Timber operations on TPZ are statutorily deemed to not be a nuisance. Complies with Forest Practice Rule requirements for notifying neighbors within 300 feet of proposed harvesting operations.				
Alt. C1 May 2002 DFMP						Timber operations on TPZ are statutorily deemed to not be a nuisance. These alternatives require a consistent 200-foot neighbor buffer, as mapped, with limited silvicultural treatment options when the adjacent parcel is residential.				
Alt. C2 Nov. 2002 Plan										
Alt. D										
Alt. E						Timber operations on TPZ are statutorily deemed to not be a nuisance. This alternative prohibits harvesting adjacent to non-timberland neighbors.				
Alt. F						Timber operations on TPZ are statutorily deemed to not be a nuisance. Limits potential impacts on neighbors by minimizing the amount of even-aged management.				

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR PROPOSED JDSF MANAGEMENT PLAN

Table VII.11.3. Comparison of Land Use Impacts Among the Various Alternatives.						
Alternatives					Discussion	
Impact*	1	2	3	4	5	*Impact Levels: (1) Beneficial (2) No Impact (3) Less than Significant (4) Less than Significant after Mitigation (5) Significant–Mitigation Not Feasible
Impact 3. Would implementation of the Management Plan result in adverse cumulative impacts to adjacent landowners in the form of reduced enjoyment in the use of their property or a loss of property values.						
Alt A						Given the minimal level of management activity under this alternative, the cumulative impact will be less than significant.
Alt. B						While timber operations on TPZ are statutorily deemed to not be a nuisance, this alternative makes greater use of intensive evenaged harvest prescriptions than any of the other alternatives while providing no neighbor buffers. Repeated intensive harvests adjacent to non-timberland ownerships could impact the adjacent landowner's enjoyment of his/her property and reduce land values. This impact could be mitigated to less than significant through the use of a 200-foot neighbor buffer.
Alt. C1 May 2002 DFMP						Timber operations on TPZ are statutorily deemed to not be a nuisance. These alternatives require a consistent 200-foot neighbor buffer, as mapped, with limited silvicultural treatment options when the adjacent parcel is residential.
Alt. C2 Nov. 2002 Plan						
Alt. D						
Alt. E						Timber operations on TPZ are statutorily deemed to not be a nuisance. This alternative prohibits harvesting adjacent to non-timberland neighbors.
Alt. F						Timber operations on TPZ are statutorily deemed to not be a nuisance. Limits potential impacts on neighbors by minimizing the amount of even-aged management.